



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/801,771	03/16/2004	Timothy L. Stewart	2170983-000006	3133
49840	7590	05/22/2006		
BAKER, DONELSON, BEARMAN, CALDWELL & BERKOWITZ, P.C. 5 CONCOURSE PARKWAY STE. #900 ATLANTA, GA 30328				
			EXAMINER LITHGOW, THOMAS M	
			ART UNIT 1724	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 05/22/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/801,771

Applicant(s)

STEWART, TIMOTHY L.

Examiner

Thomas M. Lithgow

Art Unit

1724

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on App. 16 March 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) none is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 16 March 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.


THOMAS M. LITHGOW
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 17.00

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10/04+6/05.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims 17-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Claim 17 recites among other things that the coagulant is added after the pH adjustment agent is added (see section I.). However, the specification clearly indicates just the opposite. Specifically, figures 1-3 and the corresponding description of the invention at pg. 13, lines 3-5 indicate that pH is adjusted via tank L and that the coagulant is added via tank K. It is noted that tank K is before tank L in all three figures and the sequence is specifically addressed at pg. 8, last line to pg. 9, lines 1-2. The

specification does describe in some detail the need for adjusting the pH before the flocculant is added [pg 8, lines 10+; pg. 9, lines 3+] etc.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1-9, and 11-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ramirez (US 4031006). Ramirez '006 discloses the flotation separation of meat rendering wastewaters [col. 1, line 14] in which, as shown schematically in fig. 4, there is a feed water stream at 71, a cylindrical mixing chamber 12 where recycle water and influent water are mixed, flocculant addition at 51 [col. 8, lines 24+] and flotation in the cell 52. The recycle water portion is directed through line 55 where an ionic species (alum, ferric sulfate, sulfuric acid, calcium hydroxide), and a coagulant [col. 6, line 18] are added via pump 63. It is noted that many pH agents are also coagulants based on applicant's disclosure. The chemically treated recycle water is then mixed with air in any number of air dispersers

(fig. 5-7) or dissolver (fig. 8) at 61 which may or may not involve pumping, the aerated, treated recycle water is then sent to the mixer 12 as described before.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 17-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Ramirez (US 4031006). Ramirez '006 teaches every aspect of claim 17 except for the adding the pH agent before the "coagulant" as recited in step I. Ramirez '006 includes adding the pH agent before the flocculant as it appears this is what applicant is intending to claim. In any event, the pH agent and the flocculant being the same agent it would have been obvious to stage add the reagent to get the desired cumulative effect. Basically, if the reagent

(coagulant/pH agent) is present in the desired amount, it doesn't matter how it was added.

7. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ramirez '006 as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Dixon (US 5308499). Dixon teaches the use of polyamine flocculants to clarify water containing protein contaminants (wool scour effluent) by flotation using polyamines [col. 2, lines 55-63]. To employ such a flocculant in the Ramirez '006 process in which protein containing waste water (meat packing effluent) is purified by flotation would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thomas M. Lithgow whose telephone number is 571-272-1162. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. -Fri..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Duane Smith can be reached on 571-272-1166. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "T.M. Lithgow", with a long, sweeping horizontal line extending to the left.

Thomas M. Lithgow
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1724

TML